

Goodwin's Weekly

Vol. 27

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, OCTOBER 14, 1916

No. 14

KILL THAT PROPOSED AMENDMENT

IN the constitutional convention the best talent was exercised to frame the section on the taxation of mines so that it would be fair and just. The experience of other states was called in; the consideration of the question lasted several days—the thought behind it all was that the section should be as nearly just to all the taxpayers of the state as the convention with such lights before it as it had could make it.

Constitutions should be changed from time to time as experience dictates, but the work of changing should not be given to inferior, uninformed men or men whose prejudices are stronger than their sense of duty.

This proposed amendment which the voters must pass upon next month, is a monstrosity, the more it is studied the more hideous it grows.

For instance, it permits the taxing authorities to place different rates on property for taxation, though the constitution commands that "The power of taxation shall never be surrendered, suspended or contracted away."

This amendment proposes to take that power from the people and place it in the discretion of an appointee of the State Board of Equalization.

The constitution further commands that "All taxes shall be uniform upon the same class of property."

This amendment proposes to bestow the appointee of a state board, the authority to levy double taxes on certain property. This takes the taxing power from the people and places it in the discretion of an appointee of a state board.

Moreover, the amendment proposes to leave the legislature free to fix different rates on various classes of property.

The constitution provides that men shall not be forced to pay taxes on what they do not own; that is if a man's property is mortgaged the amount of the mortgage is deducted. This amendment strikes all that out. When it comes to taxing mines, the proposed amendment cannot be read without forcing one to believe that the purpose was to cripple all mines that are being worked and to stop the further opening of mines.

The ignorance shown in the amendment, the malice apparent in the intention of the amendment lead directly to that conclusion.

The author of the amendment must have been controlled by the single thought, "I will cinch those mining men."

As we have repeatedly shown, it provides, after everything else about the mines is taxed to the limit, if a mine happens, after years of struggle, to be making a little profit, to set an inquisition to work, to ascertain the amount of that profit and then to multiply that profit by three for purposes of taxation.

It would be just as fair and just as legal, after taxing a farmer for the value of the farm and improvements, for the assessor to go to the farmer and say: "You have forty dairy cows; you must have made four hundred pounds of butter per week through forty weeks of 1915; that butter is selling for 40 cents per pound; you must have received thirty cents per pound, twenty cents of which must have been profit."

"It is my duty to levy an extra tax on your property of \$960 on account of that butter."

"By the way, too, you raised ten acres of potatoes, in all 2,000 bushels: The way potatoes are selling in Salt Lake, it is doubtless my duty to place an extra tax on three times the profit over actual cost, that you made on your potatoes."

We say to the people, in self justification stamp this infamy out and save the courts the trouble of doing it later.

Our Wise Chief Magistrate

IT is not wonderful that President Wilson has decided that it is not dignified for a president of the United States to go out on a general campaign for re-election.

There are a great many people in this country who believe that they have a right to question stump speakers who are out advocating special measures, or the election of special men, and the president is bright enough to know that were he to expose himself some very embarrassing questions might be asked by impudent or curious questioners in the crowd.

For instance:

Mr. President, when in the spring it was proved to you that American citizens by scores and hundreds in Mexico were being robbed and many of them murdered, and all you had to say was to advise Americans to get out of that country, why was it that in the autumn just prior to the congressional elections, when the news was brought you that a petty Mexican officer had insulted a boat load of Americans and their flag, but that the superior officer in the same city, the moment he heard of it made every possible apol-

ogy, you still became so angry that the flag had been insulted that you demanded that the then president of Mexico in, atonement for the outrage, should order our flag to be specially saluted, and when he declined you became so indignant that you called our whole Atlantic fleet to Vera Cruz and the landing of force enough to capture the city, causing the death of eighteen American sailors; then in a dramatic speech asked congress to sustain you in the whole flap-doodle business, and then when everything you demanded was granted, why did you lay down and return to your "watchful waiting" policy?

Or, suppose some German-American citizen were to interrupt one of the president's heroics against hyphenated-Americans, and ask of him this:

"Mr. President, considering all the antecedents attending upon your birth and where you were born, and the class of people who were your ancestors, and your own historical writings, suppose you had been born twenty years sooner, would not a hyphen be necessary now to state your real American status?"

Or again:

"Mr. President, considering your affection for the honest working man as expressed before the graduating class of several years ago, suppose the railroad unions had made their demand three years ago for an eight-hour day, at the same time telling you that they would submit to no arbitration, but if their demand was not complied with within five days, they would order a general strike, would you have laid down as you did this year, or would you have answered: 'Your refusal to have your demand considered by any fair tribunal, is conclusive proof on its face that you know what you demand is unfair, and your tone is an insult to the government of which I am the executive.'"

Or again:

"Mr. President, how about your promise that no gentleman engaged in any legitimate business need fear any tariff revisions made by the Democratic party?"

Or again:

"Where, Mr. President, is that ample and magnificent merchant marine that you assured us would light the seas with our flag and run prosperously, without bounties or subsidies?"